

Overcoming the EPR paradox

Ghenadie N. Mardari

Rutgers University, 89 George St., New Brunswick, NJ 08901

(Dated: February 1, 2008)

The EPR paradox reduced the debate between classical realism and quantum mechanics to the problem of non-locality. If non-locality is real, the gap between the two traditions cannot be bridged. If it is not, they can be merged via the principle of contextuality. The reality of non-locality will be finally established when the fair sampling assumption for correlation experiments is verified conclusively. We show that such verification can be provided simply by testing two-channel polarizing beam-splitters for polarization-dependent loss and distortion.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 03.65.Ta, 42.50.Xa

The EPR paradox is not a feature of reality. It is a trait of the Copenhagen interpretation. According to the latter, quantum mechanical properties are defined by human measurements, and cannot be assumed to exist prior to observation. If Nature is not allowed to have properties beyond the measured ones, then no other assumption could make the theory of quantum mechanics more inclusive. Yet, Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen [1] have shown that this very premise of completeness produces the necessary conclusion of incompleteness in the case of entanglement. Certain assumptions, which force us to assume that two particles become indistinguishable during close interactions, also compel us to expect that one particle would subsequently have well defined properties, when the other is measured. If such properties were independent from the process of measurement, the self-contradiction of the theory would be obvious. The only way to escape it would be to show that quantum mechanical properties are non-local. Somehow, it has to be true that one observation affects all entities in the Universe that are qualitatively indistinguishable from the one that is measured. Consequently, non-locality — unlike the EPR paradox — must be a feature of reality, if it is to provide a loophole for the Copenhagen interpretation. Though, it is not a necessary feature. The paradox can just as well be avoided by amending the interpretation which produced it.

Quantum mechanics is a theory of observables, governed by the principle of contextuality. Within its scope, physical properties of objects are inseparable from the effects of devices used to detect them. In other words, quantum mechanical observables do not quite refer to the same things as the classical properties with the same name. For example, angular momentum is observed in terms of an axis of rotation in classical systems, but only as a propensity to pass through a filter in quantum systems. Note that the undefined nature of quantum observables is not necessarily problematic in classical terms. Hence, the outcome of the toss of a coin must be undefined prior to the actual result, especially if the initial

conditions are not available without additional measurements. Yet, this has no consequence on the objective properties of coins in motion. Therefore, it is not necessarily obvious that quantum mechanical observables exhaust the properties of Nature at the fundamental level. This element of the Copenhagen interpretation demands independent justification. In the context of the EPR paradox, its validity rests entirely on the confirmation of non-locality.

The previous point can be made even stronger by showing that Einstein's realism actually demands undefined quantum observables. For example, a classical description of the photon depends on the existence of only one plane of linear polarization at the same time. The measurement of a single particle cannot reveal its original polarization, because it is likely to rotate during this interaction. Still, the probability of successful rotation is known to obey Malus' law, and it can be used to determine the initial parameters. The catch is to have a large population of identical particles, in order to divide them in separate samples for measurements at various angles. Note that quantum mechanics describes these measurements as non-commuting observables, which means that only one of them can be defined for the same particle. This corresponds to the classical description with a single plane of polarization. If a particle is assumed to switch to a certain plane during measurement, it is out of the question for it to be also defined in other planes simultaneously. Consequently, it is rather desirable to have undefined quantum observables, from a classical point of view. On the other hand, this also implies that quantum mechanics is able to provide well-defined values for unmeasured states, assuming exhaustive detection of otherwise non-commuting observables with identical quanta. At the population level, classical and quantum descriptions may be considered equivalent, with the specification that one classical unobservable is determined by a full set of quantum observables.

In some cases, non-commuting sets of observables may refer to several classical variables. The most famous ex-

ample is the position-momentum complementarity. Yet, the same explanation applies here too. The measurement of any single particle for one variable can be assumed to disturb the original state, preventing the observation of the concomitant value for the other variable. If position is measured, momentum — in the classical sense — is not “made” undefined. Only its quantum mechanical representation, as an outcome of the same measurement, is uncertain. Still, exhaustive measurement with identical particles may overcome this difficulty, as EPR have shown.

The peculiarity of position and momentum is that single measurements are sufficient to produce reliable information about one of the two variables prior to measurement, at least in principle. This is not the case for other observables, such as polarization, where single measurements are inconclusive indicators of original states. As a corollary, classical and non-local interpretations lead to identical predictions for position-momentum entanglement, but not for polarization entanglement. In a classical scenario, the existence of an original plane of polarization determines the likely measurement outcomes in all other planes, but these are only detectable as distributions. The original symmetry of identical particles does not hold for the outcomes of all individual measurements. In a non-classical scenario, the existence of a well-defined initial symmetry is technically ruled out. So, conservation must apply to post-measurement parameters, even if it is not clear how. As soon as a particle is measured, its indistinguishable partners must collapse to the same value by virtue of non-locality. Consequently, there should be many ways to produce straightforward tests of non-locality. In particular, correlation measurements for polarization-entangled photons, as suggested by Aharonov and Bohm [2], appear to be perfectly fitted to the task. As it is known, correlation measurements were indeed performed, and found to agree with the predictions of the Copenhagen interpretation. The problem was that measurements were not ideal. Only a small

share of particles could be properly detected in experiments with single photons. So, validation rests on the demonstration of fair sampling. This point calls for additional technical details about the experiments.

Consider a source that produces pairs of entangled photons with parallel planes of linear polarization. The task is to determine if they have this state before or after human observations. Each photon can be analyzed with a separate polarimeter, but only in pre-established fixed planes of detection. Parallel measurement implies that each photon can only pass through one of two orthogonal channels, *e.g.* horizontal or vertical. If pairs of photons tend to trigger coincidence counts at parallel outputs (both horizontal, or both vertical), they are described as correlated. If they produce coincidence counts at orthogonal outputs, they are anticorrelated. If there is no clear tendency either way, they are uncorrelated. Single (non-coincident) detection events are not taken into account in actual settings, because their origin is not clear. Yet, most pairs trigger single or no counts. So, fair sampling is an assumption about the subset that generates the coincidence counts. It must be representative of the whole population.

The correlation coefficients for ideal settings may be determined by a simplified formula such as this:

$$r = \frac{P_{++} + P_{--} - P_{+-} - P_{-+}}{P_{++} + P_{--} + P_{+-} + P_{-+}}, \quad (1)$$

where P_{++} and P_{--} denote the probability of identical outcomes for each pair, and P_{+-} and P_{-+} denote the probability of opposite values. For parallel measurements, the Copenhagen interpretation predicts a perfect 1 for the value of r , as shown above. The realist interpretation is more complicated, because each photon is assumed to have a plane of polarization that is inclined at an angle θ to the plane of measurement. For every value of θ , correlation is given by:

$$r = \frac{\cos^2\theta_1\cos^2\theta_2 + \sin^2\theta_1\sin^2\theta_2 - \cos^2\theta_1\sin^2\theta_2 - \sin^2\theta_1\cos^2\theta_2}{\cos^2\theta_1\cos^2\theta_2 + \sin^2\theta_1\sin^2\theta_2 + \cos^2\theta_1\sin^2\theta_2 + \sin^2\theta_1\cos^2\theta_2}. \quad (2)$$

Since θ_1 is equal to θ_2 for parallel measurements of entangled photons, this simplifies to:

$$r = \cos^2 2\theta. \quad (3)$$

When a source emits pairs with random polarization, the total expected correlation is the average of r for all values of θ . Note that the values of r in equation (3) are always positive. So, the classical model still predicts a de-

tectable total correlation ($r_{tot} \rightarrow 0.5$). This happens because entangled photons with parallel polarization do not anticorrelate in parallel measurements, regardless of the value of θ . Nevertheless, this realist interpretation cannot be reconciled with current experimental data without an assumption of unfair sampling. To be specific, pairs of photons with $\theta \rightarrow n\pi/2$, where n is a real integer, must have a significantly higher likelihood for generat-

ing coincidence counts in actual settings with orthogonal channels. Conversely, a two-channel polarizing beam splitter must have a testable propensity for polarization-dependent loss, with the highest values at $\theta \rightarrow m\pi/4$, where m is an odd real integer. As a corollary, the debate could be settled merely by testing the efficiency of two-channel polarizers that are used for correlation experiments. To the best of our knowledge, such experiments have yet to be reported.

Fair sampling was apparently not considered a long-run problem during the early tests of non-locality. Classical realism was practically discarded when the correlation coefficients were found to be closer to non-local predictions. Instead, Bohmian mechanics advanced a different sort of realism to the forefront. The new approach assumed that local hidden variables (LHV), if real, should produce well-defined quantum mechanical observables prior to measurement [3]. This innovation was ontologically opposite to the Copenhagen interpretation. Yet, as shown above, it was not any closer to Einstein's realism, which requires well-defined original values only for classical unobservables.

Bohm's realism was not verifiable with parallel correlation measurements, because it was designed to match the non-local predictions. Nevertheless, Bell's theorem [4] demonstrated a verifiable discrepancy for certain non-parallel angles of measurement. New tests were performed, only to confirm non-local predictions again. However, even the most famous test of Bell's theorem [5] acknowledged that validation is contingent upon the fair sampling assumption. Aspect *et al.* performed additional tests to show that their source and detectors were free of significant bias. What they did not test was the likelihood of polarization-dependent variation in the transmission efficiency of their two-channel polarizers. According to Adenier and Khrennikov [6, 7], a set of reasonable assumptions about polarization-dependent loss and distortion in these devices can tip the balance in favor of LHV theories. Though, as shown above, unfair sampling must also invalidate the findings for parallel measurements. Paradoxically, if non-locality fails, Bohmian LHV theories must fail too (and with them — the need for Bell's theorem). The only approach that could survive such a turn of events is Einstein's classical realism.

Given the above, we must evaluate the possibility of polarization-dependent loss in polarizing beam-splitters.

If they were ideal homogenous media, like the fields of Stern-Gerlach magnets, the description of their outputs would be exhausted by the principle of superposition. In such a case there would be no bias. As it happens, the molecular properties of crystals do not allow for such an unqualified idealization. In real settings, the output is affected by many factors, such as absorption, frequency distortion, birefringence. Furthermore, there appears to be a trade-off between polarization purity and transmission efficiency. Hence, if the polarization is not pure, more photons pass, but they may go through the wrong channel. If the quality of polarization is higher, this entails higher levels of loss in each channel. Notably, this type of loss is subject to Malus' law and must be polarization-dependent. Granted, these are mostly speculative arguments based on anecdotal evidence. The point, however, is that polarizer efficiency is the last line of defense for classical realism. Testing the quality of two-channel polarizers is of utmost scientific importance for this debate.

In conclusion, we have seen that the principle of contextuality has the potential to bridge the gap between classical and quantum mechanics. The only obstacle is ontological: the possible reality of non-locality. Yet, the latter cannot be validated or rejected until the fair sampling assumption for correlation experiments is verified. Remarkably little is needed for this — testing the two-channel polarizers for polarization-dependent loss and distortion. We must be sure that experiments detect a property of all photons, and do not just select the particles that happen to be already polarized in the planes of measurement.

-
- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47(10)**, 777 (1935).
 - [2] D. Bohm and Y. Aharonov, Phys. Rev. **108(4)**, 1070 (1957).
 - [3] D. Bohm and B. Hiley, *The undivided universe* (Routledge, 1993).
 - [4] J. Bell, *Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics* (Cambridge, 1987).
 - [5] A. Aspect, P. Grangier, and G. Roger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49(2)**, 91 (1982).
 - [6] G. Adenier and A. Khrennikov, quant-ph/0306045.
 - [7] G. Adenier and A. Khrennikov, quant-ph/0309010.